UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,585	02/05/2001	E. Stephen Crandall	1999-0735-CIP	9273
MR. S. H. SWO	7590 12/05/200 ORETSKY	EXAMINER		
AT&T CORP. I ONE AT&T W		SHINGLES, KRISTIE D		
BEDMINSTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2441	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/775,585	CRANDALL, E. STEPHEN		
Examiner	Art Unit		

		TATIOTIE D. OTHITOLEO	2771
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE F	REPLY FILED <u>03 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.
á á f	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coeriods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance (	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	-	
b) [	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection.
have be under 3 set fort may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date seen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) CE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
	 Γhe Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	filed within two months of the date of
f 1	iling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extended to the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water to be made in the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water to be made in the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water to be supported in the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extending the Notice of Appeal (3	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
(	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I(a) They raise new issues that would require further colb) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT	
(	c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		imply filed amondment concelling the
r	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)	·	•
	now the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided in the claim of the status of the claim of the claim of the status of the claim of the claim of the status of the claim of the		
<u>AFFID</u>	AVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
k	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		
€	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ll and/or appellant fails to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation IEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attached.
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowance because:
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>11/3/08</u>	
	iam C. Vaughn, Jr./ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that in the rejection made under Beach et al (6728713) in view of Greer et al (5978828) there is non-obvious and insufficient motivation to combine the teachings. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's claim language cites steps for receiving and updating "performance content". Beach et al's teaching of determining when stored database objects are out-of-date and updating the version of the stored objects is sufficient to extend to updating performance content (col.6 lines 35-56, col.15 lines 4-11), since the performance content in it's broadest form is stored data. Furthermore the stored objects in Beach et al's disclosure refer to television program objects (col.14 line 55-col.15 line 27), which obviously comprise "performance content". Greer et al's teaching modifies the teachings of Beach et al's by improving upon the updating step, wherein Greer et al introduce a querying element to determine when the last update took place and updating the content based on the queried response (col.3 line 64-col.4 line 31, col.5 line 22-col.6 line 25, col.9 lines 1-10). This combination of the cited prior art teachings not only produces a predictable result, but also exercises the implementation of a well-known technique used in the networking art. The mere label of "performance" does not render the claimed content distinguishable from other forms of content and data since, in light of the broadest interpretation, the teachings of the prior art fulfill the functionality of Applicant's claimed invention as a whole. Applicant's arguments are therefore unpersuasive and the rejection under the cited prior art of record is maintained.